R35
opy 1
LA 228
R35

AN ADDRESS

AT LELAND STANFORD, JR., UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY TENDENCIES IN AMERICA

BY

WHITELAW REID

UNIVERSITY TENDENCIES IN AMERICA

AN ADDRESS DELIVERED
AT LELAND STANFORD, JR., UNIVERSITY,
APRIL 19, 1901

BY
WHITELAW REID

PRINTED FOR THE UNIVERSITY
NEW YORK
1901

26.6
5573

NEW YORK PUBL. LIBR.
IN EXCHANGE.

UNIVERSITY TENDENCIES

AN ADDRESS AT LELAND STANFORD, JR., UNIVERSITY

[A number of passages (including the opening paragraph), which were omitted in the delivery for the sake of brevity, have been here restored.]

In the remote East, far from the centres of exact information, there has been heard now and again a rumor that, somehow, the proper freedom of academic discussion here in Stanford is in peril. How much academic freedom the breezy West requires I do not quite know; but of a few things about it I am sure. One is that academic freedom may be needed for the university itself, as well as for the professors it commissions. Another is that there is a possibility of having too much demagogic license even among teachers; and that universities and the unimportant people who conduct them, and the other unimportant people who support them, still have some rights which "cranks" are bound to respect. And another thing I feel sure of is that the present occasion would seem to indicate at least as much academic freedom in the burning discussions of the hour as most reasonable people would look for. Your honored President is the intellectual head of what has been called anti-imperialism in this country, as well as among its most serious, disinterested and courageous champions; while my opposition, in my way and according to my opportunities, to about everything he has taught on this subject has been perfectly well known to him. Nevertheless, he asked me here to speak to you to-day on the Philippine question, and to say whatever I pleased on the subject, proffering me the widest hospitality of the Stanford platform. He did exactly the same thing when the contest was far sharper and the issue apparently far more in doubt, a year ago. Now, perhaps, I am not sufficiently eager to appreciate this op-

portunity for vindicating academic freedom at Stanford, or alive to the need of it. In fact, freedom of speech anywhere is not exactly the thing of whose safety at present this country needs, as it seems to me, to be most apprehensive. At any rate I do not think it desirable to take your President at his word and "carry the war into Africa." I propose, with your leave, to adopt his alternative suggestion and address you on some tendencies of American universities.

The century just closed is commonly said to have made greater progress for the human race than all that preceded it since the dawn of the Christian era. However great, it was a progress made possible by the diffusion of learning; it was very largely stimulated by American colleges and universities, and was in nothing more remarkable or more valuable than in the progress of these colleges and universities themselves. Their growth in influence, the change in their character, resources and scope since the Civil War, and especially in the last twenty years, have been almost revolutionary.

I recall a conversation with Professor Huxley, with which I was honored in my younger days. To my question what, on the whole, he thought the greatest achievement of the century, even then nearly four fifths passed, he replied, not as I had been expecting,— the telegraph, or the telephone, or the ocean cable, or steam navigation, or the photograph, or Bessemer steel. All these he brushed aside, in order to select as the greatest and most beneficent discovery of the nineteenth century,— antiseptic surgery! Surely in a like spirit we can hold as secondary the wonderful strides America has made in subduing a continent, in spreading out over the islands of the sea, in gaining and maintaining independence, and even in abolishing slavery; while we find its noblest achievement in building up from ocean to ocean a gigantic system, free practically to the poorest as well as to the richest child of the Republic, under which any man can learn anything. Not in the armies that have so heroically borne our flag, not in the navies whose eight-inch guns, fired on the other side of the globe, lately shattered an ancient monarchy at ten thousand miles range; not in the inventions that amaze, nor in the growth that bewilders, nor even in the general diffusion of comfort that beggars the world for parallels, is your greatest glory to be found. Rather it is in the mind that has been enlightened, in the life that has been shaped and directed — in a word, it is in the kind of man that America rears.

Some of us remember the spot where we stand as an old Spanish ranch, and then as the race-track where experiments were in progress in photographing the horse in motion. All the world looks to it now. This vast and stately stone quadrangle that has risen from the old ranch, with its long-drawn colonnades, embowered in tropical foliage, and this other, still rising, without and around it, longer and more stately, lifting its arches to a sky as clear and a sun as fervid as those of Italy, afford a spacious and splendid sanctuary for learning, on the remote Pacific coast, such as the Greek philosophers never dreamed of, even when Athens was greatest or their authority at its height. We stand too near to it to realize its magnitude. It is, in fact, perhaps the greatest, certainly the most beneficent monument of parental grief ever reared in the history of civilization,— a thirty- or forty-million investment for teaching youth, from one man and his wife, in memory of a pale, winsome, lonely little lad of sixteen. I can see him still, as he mingled wistfully with younger children, in the merry companionship denied him in his own home, the night before he sailed away on the voyage from which he never came back — a pathetic figure that was to breathe out his young life in the mercifully short embrace of the Roman fever. The grief-stricken parents knew, with an instinct we now recognize as truly American, that they could do nothing else so good with the princely inheritance that would have been his as to make it a luminary that should steadily flood with the radiance of its enlightenment the youth of his native land.

If this example may not be equalled, it has at least been nobly anticipated and emulated all over the Union. In government aid, State or National, for education, and in private gifts for education, the world has never seen wealth lavished as it has been on this continent during the century just closed, and especially during its last twenty-five years. What is to come of it all? We may no doubt claim now the widest diffusion of learning in the world; but how can we best entitle ourselves to claim also the highest and best learning of the world?

Before essaying to answer that question, we may find it profitable to pause for a moment on some current complaints about what we have.

One is that education is too cheap and open to everybody; and that in consequence, largely at the public expense, whole classes in the community are educated out of fitness for any-

thing that, with their limitations of intellect or character or environment, they are capable of doing. You spoil a good day laborer, it is said, or a promising young farmer or mechanic, to make an unsuccessful shopkeeper or a worthless lawyer. But this is only another way of saying that the man has missed his vocation, and you have to look back of the schools to find the cause for that. The world is full of misfits, among the uneducated as well as the educated. Educating a man — if it be a real education and not a smattering you give him — does not intellectually unfit him for finding what he can do. He may develop a distaste for it, but that is the fault not of the education but of the character, inherited and developed by environment, that was brought to be educated. Other things being equal, an educated man is far better qualified than an uneducated one to find out what he is fit for and to keep at it. "Know thyself" is one of the first maxims of philosophy; and to help their students to that knowledge one of the highest and most sacred duties of the college. The man that is really educated has learned his limitations, and found out at least what he is not fit for. It is the half-educated person, good-naturedly carried forward in classes and studies from which his intellectual or other limitations under discriminating and honest teaching would have excluded him, that is unfitted by his so-called education for what he can do, and not fitted for anything else. To avoid turning a lad's head by letting him think he has mastered a study "well enough" when he has been found incapable of grasping it at all, is as much the duty of the conscientious educator as to teach him what he is capable of learning. When he is relentlessly turned back from the preparatory studies that are beyond him, there is the less danger of his being drawn from the productive work he should remain at, to the profession he is unfit for. No doubt, in the interest of the state and the community, the true rule for the secondary schools as well as the colleges — if the ideal could be attained — would be to make it easy for every youth to get all the education his capacity will warrant and his circumstances permit, and difficult for him to try for any more.

Another current complaint is that many of these colleges are little beyond pretentious high-schools; that they degrade degrees by giving them to unfit graduates; degrade learning by lowering its standards, and degrade men by making them charlatans while calling them and making them think themselves scholars. There is an element of justice here, as there is apt to

be in wide-spread complaints of almost any sort. But it is not true that a community is worse off for having feeble colleges; though certainly it would always be better off if it had better ones. In various educational publications—and among others in one sent under the authority of the State of New York to represent the condition of our education in the World's Fair at Paris—there is free censure of the State of Ohio for dissipating on thirty-six small colleges energies which might make one or two great ones. But does not this miss the real objection to the condition in Ohio? If there is a valid objection at all, it must be less that the colleges are not large, than that they are not good.

A third complaint, then, and a just one, is that an undignified and unworthy competition for students among some weak colleges and universities has lowered courses of study, cheapened degrees, deceived students and generally degraded education. The aim has been to see how soon they could turn students out, not how much they could teach them. Thus the vulgar ambition to use the numbers admitted and the fees received as a test and advertisement of success has led to the spectacle of some schools clamorously announcing, almost in the shrill fashion after which the street merchant vends his wares, that you can get as much here, owing to our superior process of cramming, in two years as you can get at the shop across the way in three,—and so have just a year saved in your lifetime in which you can be busy making money. In other schools the very source is poisoned by the admission of students without adequate preparation, on the plea that the superior facilities in the college will make up for any deficiencies in the preparatory work. One way or the other, swarms of struggling institutions which look first to numbers and fees, and only afterwards to thoroughness and adequate scope, do bring discredit upon education, do give many young people a distaste for any work they are fit for in the world, do draw to the cities shoals of people who would live better and stand higher in the country, and do crowd the professions with worthless lawyers, physicians and clergymen who ought to be at the plough. But it is the sham, not the education that does the harm; and that sham should be hunted down relentlessly, whether found in the colleges themselves, or in the medical or other professional schools of the universities.

There is a just complaint, too, against institutions of a better class for the low and book-keeping spirit in which matters of

learning are sometimes treated. Thus this question is occasionally made the vital one, not what has he learned? but how many hours has he given to the study? and above all is there a system of educational hocus-pocus, a plan for the student to hoist himself to the educational ceiling by a tug at his educational boot-straps, through the ingenious process of counting these same hours twice — once for the college and once for the professional training that is to follow! Grave, grown men, who imagine themselves engaged in promoting advanced learning, have been found to write out the details for this educational sleight-of-hand, and insinuatingly explain to ingenuous youth how the time devoted to this or that particular study may be contrived, like Box and Cox's bedroom, or like Goldsmith's furniture, a double debt to pay, a chest of drawers in college and a bed of down in the Law School! To make hours of study rather than maturity of mind and acquirement the preliminary for professional courses, and then to select the studies so that these hours can be counted first on the preliminary and again on the professional work, is the sort of shifty thrift that in less ideal realms is apt to bring a man to the constable.

Nevertheless, after its bad fashion, this practice does meet another popular complaint. If a boy is to work his way in life, parents often say, he cannot spare so much time before getting at it. The young man kept in college till twenty-two, and in professional studies three or four years more, starts at twenty-five or twenty-six, it is complained, in a competition that can only be disastrous, with the boy who set up for himself at eighteen. Now if the end of educating a man is only to get him ready to keep a shop, or run a factory or an iron-mill, or to go into Wall Street, or in some way merely to make money, I am not much inclined to dispute that contention. At least it is difficult to match from among college or university graduates such an array of non-collegiate names, representing the greatest present business success, as will readily occur to every one. The men who consolidated the Astor fortune came, it is true, from Heidelberg, but the man who founded it did not. The founders of the Vanderbilt, the Morgan, the Moses Taylor, the Goelet, the Mackay, the Gould, or the Cooper fortunes came from no college at home or abroad. Take the most conspicuous business successes, confessedly won and maintained by high ability, now or recently at the front in New York. C. P. Huntington, for example, was emancipated from schools of any kind long before he was eighteen. So were John and William Rocke-

feller, and so — not to weary you with mere enumeration — so was Andrew Carnegie. The latter even goes so far as to hold college training a positive disqualification for business. "The graduate has not the slightest chance," he says, "as against the boy who swept the office."

A distinguished ex-President of the United States who has recently given this subject some consideration, remarks acutely enough that the methods in great enterprises have so changed of late as to demand a higher grade of education, and that the new competition easily distances the self-made man who starts young without equal equipment for the race. In the field particularly of applied science and invention the ex-President has much reason already for his belief; and the tendencies of an age in which the engineer, the chemist, and the electrician threaten to be kings are sure to do a great deal more to confirm it. But the fact remains that, within the general knowledge, the very greatest business successes of the last quarter of a century, the greatest quite up to this present moment, have been more generally won by men who were at work instead of in college before twenty.

What then? Must men who expect to follow business careers abandon the joy and comfort of a liberal education? There are several answers. One is the argumentum ad hominem. The successful self-made man scarcely ever favors that course himself, when it comes to the education of his own sons. Another is that there are specialized courses provided by all the leading colleges now, which partly meet the wants of those who think they *must* begin life by seventeen or eighteen.

But, more conclusive than either, there are better things to aim at than mere money-making,— at least for those not pressed by an inexorable necessity,— higher joys than that of simple business success. If there are many who must forego these for the sake of beginning life prematurely,— sweeping out the shop, as Mr. Carnegie puts it, in the hope of coming some day to own the shop,— that is no reason why the institutions of higher learning should not develop along the best lines for the sake of the steadily increasing number in this prosperous land who *can* take time for the best things. This is no longer a young, poor people on a wild, unexplored continent, struggling desperately with hard circumstances to make a beginning. It is a great nation, rich with the unprecedented progress and accumulated prosperity of a hundred years. The average man no longer needs, like the sons of the pioneers, to sacrifice the highest

things of which he is capable for the sake of getting into the shop early, so as not to be outstripped in the mere race for a living. Success in American life hereafter will be measured with more characters than merely the dollar-mark; and American education must be shaped in the future to fit the man, rather than merely his business. Many, no doubt, who will hold deservedly high places in the twentieth century must be at work by eighteen or earlier; but that is a reason for giving them such an education as they need and can assimilate, not for lowering the college standard, to the detriment of all the rest, in order to give them the deceptive decoration of a diploma thus depreciated and undeserved.

Akin to this tendency to cheapen the lower degrees for the sake of students who lack the time to earn them is another error, barely showing itself, in quarters more advanced, of which whispers begin to be heard. This is the fault of encouraging post-graduate study for the higher learning, less for its own sake than for the degree. Thus one reads in a recent and important educational authority about the respective advantages of divers ways and means of "studying for the Doctorate, as the goal to which the graduate student presses on." It is a high ambition, no doubt. And yet there have been educational authorities with a loftier view of their mission, who sought to lead their students to move on a higher plane and strive for a worthier goal. If students are encouraged to select what advanced learning they are to seek, and to shape the course of study they adopt in any measure with reference simply to its degree-producing powers,—if they do not seek it for itself and choose the course purely because it is the most helpful to the end, then our post-graduate courses must have less value and our degrees must convey less distinction. The man who serves his imperilled countrymen in an alarming crisis by a supreme act of devotion may well prize the Victoria Cross with which his proud and grateful country distinguishes him. But if he laid his course, not as a patriot to do his duty to his imperilled countrymen, but merely as an adventurer, feeling the need of decoration, to hunt for the quickest and easiest opportunity to get it, the cross wears another aspect if won, and carries an altogether different value.

There are objectors, too, who question the advantage of the present overwhelming tendency, especially at the West, towards collegiate and university co-education. Certainly in no part of the educational field has greater progress been made than in the

facilities for the education of women; and shrivelled must be the soul that would have it otherwise. Vassar, Smith, Wellesley, Bryn Mawr, have long marked a higher standard than similar schools for women in other lands; and now colleges abroad, like Girton and Newnham, enjoying high university affiliations, are at last finding their worthy counterparts here in Radcliffe and Barnard and others. It is an inspiring progress, and even if it may have been carried in some institutions to an illogical development, the error, if error there be, will cure itself. But certainly it must be admitted that the Western trend to direct co-education in colleges and universities is plainly at variance with another development we have all regarded as characteristic of progress towards the higher education,— the process of differentiation and specialization. Grant at once, as a thing nobody in this age dreams of questioning, the right of woman, quite as clear as the right of man, to learn everything. But the fact remains that the great majority of women seeking an advanced education will probably in time come to do the same thing the men do,— specialize it with reference to the life they are going to lead; and the girl graduate from one of the great co-educational universities is not, as a rule, going to lead the same life as the bachelor of science or the bachelor of electrical engineering. If the highest progress be in differentiation and specialization of effort, then women are entitled to that progress as well as men; and university co-education, though, perhaps, as yet the most economical, is manifestly not the best way of supplying it. On the disadvantages that some think they find in throwing the two sexes into the intimacy of a common college life at the most impressionable period, when their thoughts ought to be on their books and are so easily kindled instead into dreams of love and matrimony, I do not imagine it profitable to dwell. The parents who send their sons and daughters to co-educational institutions know what they are doing. One can only say about the system they are likely to select, what Mr. Lincoln said about the book: "If you like this kind of a book, then I reckon this is just about the book you would like."

An acute English observer, Mr. Bryce, remarks that German universities are popular, but not free; English universities free, but not popular; and American universities both popular and free. Let us hope that these characteristics in our system may be preserved in their purity. Long may we continue to have

L. of C.

our universities popular in the sense that they are open on equal terms to every rank and condition of life — that they have no unwritten laws restricting them to the sons of gentlemen of birth or distinction, and making them uncomfortable for anybody else. Long may they remain free, in the sense that the instruction is limited only by the desire to seek and to teach the truth. But the popularity will be harmful if it degenerates into a vulgar catering for numbers by throwing down the bars of admission which time and experience have sanctioned; and the liberty will be disastrous if it degenerates into license, whether for the students in their conduct, or for the professors in their teaching. The freedom for a student which absolves him from the obligations of a gentleman is no better and no worse than the freedom for a professor which absolves him from the duties of a patriot, and converts his relations to his country into general railings against its present and its past policy, rather than the exercise of an influence, justly belonging to the highly educated and highly placed, upon the country's future. It is a misfortune for the colleges, and no less for the country, when the trusted instructors are out of sympathy with its history, with its development, and with the men who made the one and are guiding the other.

It was suggested a few minutes ago that the splendid gifts of learning which illuminate and ennoble our history, and in an unprecedented degree our recent history, entitle us to expect for our country the highest and best learning of the world. But what is the highest and best? Or, if that question be too abstract for a conclusive answer, what is the highest and best for this country? What sort of education does a republic most need in the days of its overwhelming success and unparalleled prosperity? Perhaps a solution may be easier if we state the problem differently. What defects of human character does a republic tend to develop, that the higher education should correct?

Well, our critics, foreign and domestic, are free-spoken enough to leave us little difficulty in finding answers to that. We are conceited beyond endurance. We brag like Bombastes. We are slow to believe that other people can teach us anything. We have the provincial idea that because we are conspicuously ahead in some things we are ahead in everything. We reach conclusions without seeing a subject on all sides, and are then intolerant of diversity of opinion. We value big things simply because of their bigness. We live in a whirl of money-making,

or amusement, or excitement of some kind; we rarely take time to think of other things, and, because we are too busy for it ourselves, we let the newspapers make up our minds for us. When acting collectively we are liable to go off at half cock, and are swept by sudden waves of popular excitement like the French. We do so many things in a hurry that often we fail to do some of them thoroughly. We come to think that pretty well is good enough; that veneer is better than the solid mahogany, looking just as well and costing far less; that a chromo is as good as the oil-painting from which a casual glance does not distinguish it; that a plaster cast of the Venus of Milo is, "for practical purposes," about as good as the broken and discolored old marble in the Louvre; that a machine-made American carpet is as good as the rug from the looms of India; a pot-metal vase for the garden as good as one of bronze or marble; an iron cornice, painted stone-color, as good as one of the carved stone; always the thing that has been done by wholesale by machinery, "more in the prevailing style," and just as good for practical people as the thing patiently wrought in every line to individual beauty by a trained and beauty-loving intelligence.

Do not these superficial defects go deeper? Has there not been a constant tendency, developed by democratic institutions thus far everywhere, in ancient times as well as our own, to level down; sometimes to pare off individualism in character or action; often to resent and pull down superiority, to encourage mediocrity, and to try to believe, if not to avow, as a necessary article of true democratic faith, that mediocrity is equal to the best and just as good? Naturally this tendency, which a republic generally seems to develop, will lead to treating men not as individuals, but in great masses. It thus invades the field of education and converts the noblest work confided to man — the moulding, one might almost say the very creation of individual character — into high-pressure arrangements for the production of scholars by wholesale; into schemes to shape and manufacture characters and lives like watches or steam-engines by machinery.

Should the best American education tend to control this bias of republican institutions or be controlled by it? If the latter, then let us make our colleges and universities bigger and bigger; crowd more scores and hundreds of eager, immature individual human units into each class, and deal with them in gross; run our institutions as one or two (for better reasons, no doubt) are already run, on full time or overtime, like a factory, summer and winter, spring and autumn; show their students

how to make one hour count for two; veneer and varnish them as quickly as possible; and let each educational factory be rated by the rapidity of its methods and the quantity of its output. But if the best education for a republic should tend to counteract the defects it develops, and to elevate and strengthen it for a long and successful life, is it not clear that we shall do better with less wholesale processes, that our effort must be to exert individual influence upon the individual youth to be trained with reference to his individual wants, and that if changes are to occur, it is better colleges we want instead of bigger ones?

Consider, if you are willing to pause long enough, the extent to which we have gone in banishing the parent or teacher from his old close and intimate influence with the individual boy. The most fashionable educational tendency of the day, particularly in our large cities, eliminates family influence from the school period almost at the outset by abandoning our excellent secondary schools, or even the local private schools, in either of which that influence might still be maintained. The boy must not be made a mollycoddle. He must not be kept tied to his mother's apron strings. He must learn to rough it with other boys, and dig his strenuous way through the rough and tumble of a distant boarding-school without being able to run always to sympathizing parents in trouble or in trivial illness. That, we are told, is the only way to make a man of him. He must not be guarded from evil. To do that long is impossible; therefore take him away from his family life, expose him early to contamination, and let him learn to conquer it, if he can, by fighting his battle alone. And so the boy must be thrown more with other boys than with parents or teachers from the outset, and must be sent at a tender age to St. Paul's or St. Mark's or Groton or Lawrenceville, or the Pacific coast equivalents, for a four or six years' stay. Then the parents, who have scarcely seen him save at vacations, part with him again, and he enters one of the big colleges. Here he finds himself in a class of several hundred freshmen, with little possibility for more than a speaking acquaintance with the professors in the classroom, and less likelihood of much close contact with them outside. The individual and social substitutes for family influence that make up the refined life of the English university are largely lacking in the American system, and the young men in these big colleges are still necessarily dealt with in the mass, and given their education by wholesale.

Consider next how the intense practicality of our education hitherto — the insistent demand for something from the colleges that would let the student think himself liberally educated, and yet let him begin life early — has drawn us away from the highest aims. Let us revert again to the inquiry, What sort of an education does a republic most need for its most favored citizens in the days of its bewildering success and prosperity? Do not the very quality of its defects and the nature of its dangers compel the answer that what the Republic thus needs is not merely or mostly knowledge? No doubt it must always strive for an education that will place the experience of the world in all ages at its service. But beyond and far above that must be its development of the disposition for reflection, the power to consider dispassionately, the capacity to reason accurately, and then to reach just judgments on these acquired facts. One of the easiest tasks in the world is to learn things. The child does it almost by instinct. One of the hardest tasks in the world is to think about things exactly, judiciously, correctly; to estimate, to weigh, to give the proper value to each, to reach sound conclusions,— in a word, to make the knowledge of things of the most value for the conduct of life. When the crude knowledge has thus been assimilated by the reflective mind, as the ruminating animal assimilates the crude food for the physical frame, there has come a new quality to the student. Out of the things he has learned and the philosophy that has taught him their meanings and relations have come the faculty of seeing straight and of thinking straight, and from those follow, as certainly as the needle follows the pole, the crowning gift of living straight. Knowledge as the basis there must be: knowledge of what the world has done and is doing, in civics, in economics, in everything relating to the history or the science of government; knowledge of man,—the being to be governed,— of the motives that influence his conduct, the circumstances that change his purpose, what his mind is and how it works; knowledge of the languages he works with, of the literature that inspires him and the laws that govern him; knowledge of the ideas he cherishes, the faith he holds, the customs and prejudices that hold him. But all these are as nothing, and may even be worse, without the reflection, the reasoning, the judgment that transmute them into charts for our guidance and safeguards against our dangers. First, then, the Republic, where every citizen is a ruler, needs knowledge, of course, for its citizens; but next and more it needs the judg-

ment which can vitalize knowledge; and then the character, born of the right principles coming from the two, which fructifies both and becomes the most precious possession of the state.

In thus noting the need of more direct personal contact and individual influence between teacher and taught, or in noting the need of strengthening the college course where it has been weakened by changes making it more attractive to practical people who are in a hurry to begin life, there is not the slightest intention to disparage or undervalue the undeniable merits of what we have. Surely, enough has been said already to show an adequate appreciation of our progress under the present system and the marvels it has wrought. But it is fair, I think, to say, in a general way, and with admission in advance of the thousands of exceptions, that hitherto our education in this country has been to make a living. The country is old enough and prosperous enough now to warrant us in expecting that henceforth it will be more an education to make a life. I would plead, then, for a system that would put the most into one's life, rather than for that which enables one quickest to begin life and earn a living. That, too, has its place, supremely important in the past, highly important still and always. But let us not deceive ourselves as to proportions and values. It is not the highest. To make a life, full, rounded, with balanced character and serenity of judgment, with trained capacities for the highest work, the highest appreciation, the fullest and purest enjoyment,— that is a greater thing than to make a living!

Unless these observations have wholly missed their purpose, they must now have led your minds at least to consider, if not to accept, two propositions which seem to me to sum up the next advances for American colleges and universities. They need now to give more individual attention to the individual pupil, and they need to lead him on paths to the best learning for the best life, rather than merely for the quickest business or professional success. The first proposition does not point to big colleges; and the second does not point to university development exclusively on the lines thus far most in favor. Bigger colleges must mean less individual influence on the eager, immature mind; the specialization most in favor now in our universities is that which leads to ways to make a living, and while no one would want less of that, the highest education must give more of something else.

We started in America with the English idea of a college. Later we grew into the German idea of a university. We changed the English college, after the American fashion, by making it bigger and, as we thought, more practical. Then we rejected the English idea of a university, partly because the "shrieks of locality," as some politicians once expressed it, made such a grouping of colleges at one spot difficult, if not impossible; but still more because the English idea chiefly encouraged what might be called pure learning, as distinguished from the professional and specialized teaching which was a more marked characteristic of the German university. The outcome is, first, colleges sometimes as big as half a dozen English ones, and then certain professional, scientific and technical schools added, and the whole called a university. But this has been attended by material changes in the course of the college intended to facilitate entrance to, and perhaps quicken passage through, the university. It all makes, beyond question, an admirable outcome for the practical people that needed and organized it. But it is not the best outcome now for a people who have outgrown their early needs.

When the next Stanford has another forty millions or more to expend in an effort to give his country an institution of learning worthy of its glorious present and its bewildering future, why not begin with the idea of an eminent church dignitary of the West, that a university, primarily considered, is less a school than an atmosphere? Let him create the atmosphere by grouping and organizing his colleges in close and friendly emulation, as at Oxford or Cambridge. Then let him see to it that the entrance requirements admit only students capable of using the opportunities he offers, and that the colleges prescribe only those courses of study which the best experience of the world has found to furnish the best basis for any profession, or for further intellectual training in any direction. When he has thus secured them the best start, let him open to the graduates of these colleges a real university, comprising the best features of both the English and the German type, with the splendid encouragement Oxford and Cambridge offer for the further prosecution of learning for its own sake, and with all the professional, scientific, technological and other schools and courses we have already adapted from German models and improved upon from our own experience.

Suppose some one had the power to plant Dartmouth and Williams, Amherst and Bowdoin and Brown and Smith in one

neighborhood, retaining for each its separate organization, its individual merits and inspiring history, and to build on them the University of New England. Who does not perceive that here would be an atmosphere of learning, an emulation and inspiration for the best work, an authority, a dignity, a promise and potency such as the New World has never yet seen in the educational field? Of course it is wildly impossible. But in dealing with younger institutions, or in establishing new ones with the colossal pecuniary power some educational benefactors now wield, such a system could be begun. In that direction might be found a realization of the higher aims that have been indicated. In such a group of colleges, none need be so overgrown as to make individual contact between the pupil and the professor impossible; or if one is, a smaller one, beside it, will have the same atmosphere and the same university control and advantages. None need dilute its course by "electives" which belong in the university, or lower its course to accommodate the haste of those who must begin life early. From such a group of colleges the true university would rise naturally, broad-based and spreading at will in every direction to which the trained mind, now competent to choose for itself, would seek to extend its studies. But the more stimulating atmosphere and the more strictly collegiate training would alike insure the direction of larger numbers to the fields of languages, history, philosophy, mathematics and pure science, which give the training more needful and more useful for a republic than anywhere else, and which properly rank first in an institution of the highest learning that aims to cover all the great departments of intellectual life. The opportunity for differentiation and specialization in educational effort would be greater than ever, but it would be put where it belongs, not with the youth in his plastic, uncertain, formative period, but with the trained young man, competent to select and eager to pursue. Thus when the graduate passed from the college, whether he devoted himself chiefly to the highest learning or sought at once an education in applied science or in a profession, he would, at any rate, carry into the university a mind fit for the work it demands. To borrow the happy illustration of President Stryker of Hamilton, the college would have made the intellectual iron that came to it into steel; and therefore the university would not be wasting its time in trying to put a fine edge upon pot-metal.

Perhaps it is a fanciful idea that we shall ever group colleges anywhere in a great university in America, as circumstances

that can never be reproduced did group them, six or seven centuries ago, on the banks of the Cam and the Isis. We have gone far, with good results, on another road. The old universities sprang from a desire for a wider learning than the schools of the cathedrals and monks would furnish. So the American university of to-day sprang from a need for a wider and more practical learning than those English and Continental models furnished; and we can no more afford to lose this widening and extension than we can afford to go back to the schools of the cathedrals. But the universities that sprang up in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries held on to the best in the schools they replaced. Now that we have the leisure and the opportunities which great growth and great prosperity confer, it should be our instinct to hold on to the best in the university system which we replaced with our own a hundred years ago. Whether the exact organization can be reproduced or not, the essentials are surely within reach.

First, the university atmosphere, which can be attained only by the flocking of teachers and pupils to a great educational centre.

Secondly, the individual influence of the teacher upon the pupil, especially throughout the collegiate course, which can best be attained in colleges of moderate size, under the university, by methods of instruction less formal and more vitalizing to the immature mind than merely by lectures and written examinations, and by the more intimate association, in commons and elsewhere, between professors and students.

Thirdly, the old college course as the best training for the new university work,— the humanities, to recur to the finely descriptive phrase by which our fathers designated a thorough education in the classics (to which we would gladly add also modern languages) and philosophy; next, pure mathematics, and next, science.

This ideal college course once mastered, the pot-metal has been made steel, fit for the miracle-working uses to which the university then really opens the door. Then, and not till then, is the time for the man in a hurry, who nevertheless wants a genuine liberal education, to consider how much farther and whither he will go. Then, and not till then, with disciplined mind and enlarged vision, he is competent to make his own choice from the "electives," decide in what direction his life is to turn and what further learning he will find of the most worth for his aim, whether that be profit, or the service of his fellow-men in politics or elsewhere, or merely pure intellectual

enjoyment. This collegiate course was the best basis for the higher learning the best systems of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries had to offer. It is the best basis still, as we turn to the wider and better attainments the twentieth century has to offer. It has formed for generations of our race the badge of the best title any of the race has ever worn in any land, or can wear,— the proud title of scholar and gentleman.

It is to the high duty of perpetuating and enlarging that exalted type we have the right to summon our institutions of the most advanced learning. We demand from them the combination of exact knowledge and ripe reflection that makes the scholar; the combination of right thinking and right living that makes the gentleman. There you have the greatest possibility of your colleges and universities, the consummate flower of your educational system, the inspiration and guide of progress, the safeguard of society, the ornament and defence of the Republic.

We have lately seen the close of a century which in the splendor of its discoveries and the rapidity of its progress surpassed all that went before it. We stand at the dawn of a century that is to surpass it still more. The Republic closed the old century with a continental population of not far from eighty millions, and perhaps fifteen or sixteen millions more in its dependencies. The new century, before its close, may see that population, even if the ratio of increase be reduced to a third or fourth of the present average, rising to the almost incomprehensible number of three hundred millions. The Republic enters this new century with the control of the continent of the future, of the ocean of the future, and of the two richest archipelagoes of the world. It will pass no self-denying ordinance against growth. It faces the dazzling prospect with undazzled eyes, and scorns to shrink back from greatness through craven fear of being great. From insignificant beginnings it moved to the head of the material progress of the nineteenth century. Gentlemen and Scholars of Stanford, your field, and that of the American universities in general, is not merely material, but intellectual and moral. It is your task in the twentieth century to see to it that this Republic of our love and pride, whose world-wide extent and illimitable opportunities thus confuse the understanding and bewilder the imagination, shall respond not unworthily to the wider duties of its fortune, shall rise to preëminence in more than material progress, and march at the head of the culminating civilization of the world.

0 022 164 966 7